



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,867	09/25/2003	Masahiro Suzuki	20241/0207058-US0	5798
7278	7590	12/28/2009	[REDACTED]	EXAMINER
DARBY & DARBY P.C.	P.O. BOX 770	Church Street Station	[REDACTED]	YOUNG, SHAWQUIA
New York, NY 10008-0770			[REDACTED]	ART UNIT
				PAPER NUMBER
			1626	
			[REDACTED]	MAIL DATE
				DELIVERY MODE
			12/28/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/670,867	SUZUKI, MASAHIRO	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	SHAWQUIA YOUNG	1626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 3,4,9 and 11-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 3,4,9 and 11-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/11/09</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                         |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 3, 4, 9 and 11-13 are currently pending in the instant application.

Applicants have cancelled claim 10 in an amendment filed on August 10, 2009. Claims 3, 4, 9 and 11-13 are rejected in the Office Action.

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 11, 2009 has been entered.

### **I. *Response to Arguments/Remarks***

Applicants' amendment, filed August 10, 2009, has been fully considered but does not overcome the rejection of claims 3, 4, 9 and 11-13 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over US patent 5,980,926 in view of US Patent No. 5,208,030.

Applicants argue that the added limitation wherein the first and second active ingredients have two different average particle sizes to the independent claims 3, 11 and 12 overcome the 103 rejection. However, the Examiner wants to point out that it in In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955), it was well established that the selection of particle size is not a patentable modification in the absence of unobvious results.

Applicants have not provided any unexpected results that were found when each of the first and second active ingredients have different average particle sizes and therefore the limitation is not a patentable modification and the Examiner has maintained the 103 rejection.

## **II. *Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on September 11, 2009 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement has been considered by the examiner.

## **III. *Rejection(s)***

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) that forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1,148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

**Claims 3, 4, 9 and 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (USPN 5,980,926) in view of Hoy et al. (USPN 5,208,030).**

Suzuki teaches a water dispersible granule formulation and method of making thereof. Specifically, Suzuki teaches a method of making said water dispersible granule by a) admixing an active agent (e.g., triflumizole), a wetting and dispersing agent (e.g., tristyryl phenyl ether, ethylene oxide, sodium polycarboxylate), and water and subjecting the mixture to wet granulation to produce "WDG-SC" with an average particle size of 1.5 microns; b) admixing a wetting and dispersing agent (e.g., sodium alkylnaphthalenesulfonate, sodium alkylbenzenesulfonate, a formaldehyde condensate of sodium lignosulfonate), mineral carriers (e.g., diatomaceous earth and potassium chloride) and subjecting the mixture to dry milling to produce "WDG-WP"; c) mixing "WDG-SC" and "WDG-WP" and then granulating and drying the mixture (Example 1). Suzuki also teaches that "any pesticide which is in solid at an ambient temperature, is

Art Unit: 1626

hardly-soluble in water and preferably has a solubility in water as much as 2000 pm can be used as the pesticidal component usable in the present invention without any limitation, and more than 2 pesticidal components may be used in combination" (col. 2, lines 40-45). Suzuki also teaches particular pesticides including triflumizole, thiuram, fluazinam, anilazine, captan, hexythiazox, benzoximate, tebufenpyrad, ziram, thiophanate-methyl and benzamideixime compounds represented by a general formula (1) (col. 2, lines 45-60).

With respect to the dry milling step, Suzuki is silent to a second active ingredient that is an agricultural chemical selected from the group consisting of an insecticide, fungicide or herbicide.

Hoy teaches a method of making a dosage device comprising dry milling at least one active ingredient to an average particle size of less than 5 microns. Hoy also teaches that any active ingredient may be used, especially a pesticide, such as an insecticide, herbicide, fungicide or the like (col. 1). Hoy further teaches the particular active agents, thiophanae methyl, captan, thiram, and hexythiazox (col. 1; claim 7) as well as incorporating wetting/dispersing agents and absorptive carriers such as the particular mineral carriers, diatomaceous earth or clay (col. 2). Because both references teach products comprising various pesticides that utilize similar ingredients and include similar methods for the same purpose, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include another active agent, such as a pesticide, in order to achieve the predictable result of eliminating a wider range of pests and/or fungi. Additionally, it is desirable from an economic standpoint to have one multi-

purpose dosage device. Thus, in Suzuki it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include another active, such as a pesticide, in the dry milling step as suggested by Hoy.

Suzuki is silent to the average particle size of about 3 microns to about 30 microns of the second active agent.

Hoy teaches an active ingredient dosage device and a method of making said device (col. 1, lines 1-9). More specifically, Hoy teaches including "at least one active ingredient" and comminuting said active ingredient to an "average particle size of less than 5 microns" (col. 1, lines 10-12). Hoy also teaches "the comminution may be effected by dry milling the active ingredient, e.g. by means of micronization, to the desired particle size" (col. 1, lines 20-23). Also, Hoy teaches the active ingredient can be any suitable active ingredient (col. 1, line 36). It should be noted that Hoy's "less than 5 microns" reads on the claimed "about 3 to about 30 microns" because they are overlapping ranges. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include a particle size of less than 5 microns because said size promotes "effective, accurate and even distribution" of the active ingredient (col. 6, line 33). A practitioner would have reasonably expected an active ingredient with a particle size of less than 5 microns to be evenly distributed when dispersed in water. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the average particle size of about 3 microns to about 30 microns as suggested by Hoy.

Applicants have added the limitation "wherein each of the first and second active ingredients have different average particle sizes" to claims 3, 11 and 12." However, the

Art Unit: 1626

Examiner wants to point out that it in In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955), it was well established that the selection of particle size is not a patentable modification in the absence of unobvious results. Applicants have not provided any unexpected results that were found when each of the first and second active ingredients have different average particle sizes and therefore the limitation is not a patentable modification.

### III. Conclusion

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawquia Young whose telephone number is 571-272-9043. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM-3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane can be reached on 571-272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Shawquia Young/

Examiner, Art Unit 1626

/Rebecca L Anderson/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1626